

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
COLUMBUS DIVISION

HOMER DOUGLAS COBB, IV,	*	
Plaintiff,	*	
vs.	*	CASE NO. 4:23-cv-109 (CDL)
HON. BEN RICHARDSON, <i>et al.</i> ,	*	
Defendants.	*	

---

O R D E R

Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, filed a complaint entitled "CLASS ACTION LAW SUIT COMPLAINT" and "DEMAND FOR ERROR FREE TRIAL DE-NOVO" and "PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS QUO WARRANTO UNDER A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS TO ISSUE A COURT ORDER FOR THE ARREST OF A FEW WELL KNOWN DEEP STATE MEMBERS" and "DEMAND TO RESET THE CONSTITUTIONAL RULE OF LAW BY USING TITLE 16 OF THE AMERICAN JURISPRUDENCE 2D, LATE LAW BOOK SECTIONS WITHIN CHAPTER 16." Compl. 1, ECF No. 1.

The Court carefully reviewed Plaintiff's Complaint, which poses questions like "Who Owns the Law?" and "Dose [sic] the Plaintiff have a Legal binding Psychological Contract with the government to fix the Party that dose [sic] not understand the Federal Constitutional Rule of Law?" and "will this Demand for the Tree of Liberty to be Water down [sic] with the Blood of The Deep State Trader's [sic] be granted?" *Id.* at 2. The Complaint also

contains various statements about Russia, the Bible, former President Trump, Plaintiff's 1991 and 2016 felony charges, some state legislation "to Legally Destroy all Trial and Prison Records," Plaintiff's divorce, and how Plaintiff "and Members of his influence Psychological Appointed Cabinet is trying to stop the Hostile take over by Deep State." *Id.* at 5-7. Plaintiff appears to seek a "Constitutional Reset" and some type of relief from Defendant Pelkey, who allegedly played "Head Games" with Plaintiff's "Beloved Wife." *Id.* at 7-8.

The Complaint contains no "short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction" as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(1). Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, and they must "inquire into subject matter jurisdiction *sua sponte* whenever it may be lacking." *Univ. of S. Alabama v. Am. Tobacco Co.*, 168 F.3d 405, 410 (11th Cir. 1999). Based on the Court's review of Plaintiff's Complaint, the Court cannot discern any basis for federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, for diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, or for jurisdiction under a specific statutory grant. Even if Plaintiff had invoked federal jurisdiction, Plaintiff's Complaint does not appear to contain any claim that has an arguable basis in law or in fact, and it is unclear how any amendment could cure Plaintiff's Complaint.

For these reasons, the Court dismisses Plaintiff's Complaint without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and because the Complaint lacks a claim that has an arguable basis in law or in fact.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 24th day of August, 2023.

s/Clay D. Land

---

CLAY D. LAND

U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA